Appl. No. 10/614,394
Amdt. Dated 6/3/2005
Response to Office action dated 3/24/2005

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending. No new matter has been added.

Disclaimers Relating to Claim Interpretation and Prosecution History Estoppel

Any reference herein to "the invention" is intended to refer to the specific claim or claims being addressed herein. The claims of this Application are intended to stand on their own and are not to be read in light of the prosecution history of any related or unrelated patent or patent application. Furthermore, no arguments in any prosecution history relate to any claim in this Application, except for arguments specifically directed to the claim.

The independent claims were amended in the interest of expediting prosecution, not because of a specific prior art citation. It is believed that broader claims may be allowable, but the breadth of the claims as amended are acceptable and will moot prior art rejections that might be made. The amendments are supported at paragraph 23 and 26.

Interviews

The Examiner is thanked for the interviews on April 5 and 12, 2005. In the first interview, the rejection from Stautner was discussed, and the Examiner agreed that the claims were patentable over Stautner. The undersigned agreed to present the arguments in a response, and this paper constitutes that response. The Examiner explained, however, that the claims probably would be rejected from the automatic email address and URL identification included in some software products. In the second interview, this general discussion was continued, though no specific amendments or arguments were presented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 11-17, 22-28 and 33 under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by Stautner et al (USP 6,600,503 B2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

11/15

Appl. No. 10/614,394
Amdt. Dated 6/3/2005
Response to Office action dated 3/24/2005

Stautner discloses an integrated content guide for interactive selection of content and services on personal computer systems with multiple sources and multiple media presentation. In Stautner, a user may be presented with various modes of arrangement of information, generally featuring graphically distinct regions in the display. Stautner refers to these areas as "cells". A cell may be associated, for example, with an individual television program and could contain the title of a program. According to Stautner, "A navigational device, such as an arrow key, mouse or other type of pointing mechanism, either wired or on a wireless remote control, may be used to select or highlight a particular cell."[1]

In rejecting these claims, the Examiner cited column 6, lines 24-55, with the most relevant portions underlined:

Upon selecting an individual icon or a content within a cell, various actions are taken. These actions are generally conventional in nature. However tying them to a given icon on a content guide is new to this invention. Specifically, by selecting a given icon within a cell, a television program may be selected, the tuner arrangement may be forced to a given channel, as well as executing a series of start up commands in the computer to select both a video and audio channel, which may be provided by separate sources or paths. If an icon such as icon 30 is selected, such as shown in FIG. 2, which is labeled "chat session", an individual interactive text based type of chat or an audio chat arrangement can be provided to the user. Selecting this icon would start an on-line service software application, provide a pre-stored user name into a user named field, start the dialing to connect to the on-line service, provide for the connection to be completed, log on to the on-line service, log on to the given chat session in an automatic matter by extracting from the data base the appropriate sequence of commands to execute and attach to a given chat session by substituting into this pre-programmed sequence of commands, for which the information is provided in the content guide.

In the case of viewing an advertisement or offer of merchandise, such as is shown in FIG. 2, an order can be placed, for example, for a pizza

---

[1] This is clearly referring to acts by a user.

12/15

from a national or local chain, by selecting for example icon 40. <u>An automated sequence of events performed by the computer would then extract a proper telephone number from the data base, dial the particular number and place the user in a situation where they are in voice contact with the pizza restaurant or alternatively, provide for an automatic selection of the specifications of their desired pizza.</u>

As can be seen, Stautner has only a limited disclosure with respect to telephone numbers. In this excerpt, Stautner does a database lookup to obtain a telephone number, and then displays the telephone number. Stautner explains that all of the processing is pre-programmed. In other words, the telephone numbers are pre-programmed as telephone numbers (i.e., stored in the database as telephone numbers).

Claims 1, 12 and 23 are independent. As the Examiner appears to have recognized, these claims have some similar limitations. Claim 1 is directed to "a method of displaying telephone numbers by a client computer". Claim 12 is directed to "a client computer for displaying telephone numbers". Claim 23 is directed to "a computer program product ... for conspicuously displaying telephone numbers". Claims 1 and 12 recite: "scanning the data units for telephone numbers" and "automatically identifying the telephone numbers within the data units." Claim 23 recites: "scan the data units for telephone numbers" and "automatically identify the telephone numbers within the data units". Stautner does not disclose, teach or suggest these two limitations of the respective independent claims.

Claim 1 requires "scanning the data units for telephone numbers". In Stautner, telephone numbers are retrieved from a database and displayed in cells. From the rejection, it is unclear whether the Examiner considered the claimed "data unit" to read on Stautner's cell or Stautner's data base. In either case, Stautner has no "scanning" as claimed. Instead, Stautner "extracts" telephone numbers from the data base, and then "displays" the telephone numbers in a cell. Stautner does not disclose, teach or suggest "scanning" the data base or the cells for telephone numbers.

Appl. No. 10/614,394
Amdt. Dated 6/3/2005
Response to Office action dated 3/24/2005

Claim 1 further requires "automatically identifying the telephone numbers within the data units." Stautner has no need perform a step of identifying telephone numbers within a data unit (either the data base or the cells), because Stautner's system already knows a telephone number is a telephone number because it was retrieved as a telephone number from the data base. As explained above and as shown by the excerpts cited by the Examiner, Stautner uses pre-programmed sequences of commands to manipulate known data. Thus, in Stautner, once the user has indicated that the telephone number should be dialed, Stautner's system simply performs the pre-programmed sequence associated with the cell. Stautner simply has no step of "identifying" because Stautner needs no such step.

In sum, Stautner does not disclose, teach or suggest two steps of claim 1. Nearly the same rationale applies to claims 12 and 23. Therefore, Stautner does not anticipate or render obvious claims 1, 12 or 23 and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6, 11, 13-17, 22, 24-28 and 33 are novel and non-obvious over Stautner for at least the same reasons set forth with respect to the independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 7-10, 18-21 and 29-32 under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious from Stautner. This rejection is respectfully traversed. These claims are dependent upon claims 1, 12 or 23, and are non-obvious over Stautner for at least the same reasons set forth with respect to the independent claims.

Conclusion

It is submitted, however, that the independent and dependent claims include other significant and substantial recitations which are not disclosed in the cited references. Thus, the claims are also patentable for additional reasons. However, for economy the additional grounds for patentability are not set forth here.

14/15

Appl. No. 10/614,394
Amdt. Dated 6/3/2005
Response to Office action dated 3/24/2005

In view of all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested and allowance at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney to answer any questions or to discuss steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 3, 2005

Steven C. Sereboff, Reg. No. 37,035

SoCal IP Law Group
310 N. Westlake Blvd., Suite 120
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone: 805/230-1350
Facsimile: 805/230-1355
email: info@socalip.com

15/15